



ACC - Rock Island

Q1: Will the USG consider organizing the technical library in folders by PWS and provide document titles that are more descriptive of the document content?

A1: Documents may apply to multiple PWSs or no PWSs, therefore, it may be misleading to categorize them by PWS. We will attempt to title them in a more descriptive manner to reflect the document's content. Upon release of more documents in the VTL, if there are suggestions for a better method, please let us know.

Q2: Have intellectual property issues on links been resolved with ATK?

A2: There is mixed ownership of links equipment and IP. The USG-owned property is listed on the VTL; incumbent-owned equipment/IP will not be made available. Offerors are responsible for proposing their own solution to provide links.

Q3: What Bldgs are slated (tentatively) for QWE/HVAC (air conditioning)?

A3: Bldgs 1 & 3.

Q4: Will up-to-date drawings for spare parts for link tooling be available?

A4: The USG will make available drawings of the USG-owned progressive die sets.

Q5: Volume 3/SF2B – What kinds of projects will be viewed “beneficial to the Government”?

A5: It is the offeror's responsibility to propose project(s) and articulate how the Government would benefit from the proposed project(s). **Government objectives will be identified in the final RFP.**

Q6: Ref M80A1/M62A1 – Is the M80A1 analogous to the M855A1 in design & material?

A6: It is similar in design, but slightly different in materials (e.g., different steel for penetrator).

Q7: How does the USG plan to address the lack of a TDP for M80A1/M62A1?

A7:

M80A1: The final RFP will include the technical requirements in Section C for offerors to propose to. Any changes subsequent to contract award will be handled through the Changes clause.

M62A1: Will not be included in the RFP, but will be incorporated into the contract subsequent to award.



ACC - Rock Island

Q8: Are you going to (use) RFID tags?

A8: RFID is not a requirement of the solicitation/contract.

Q9: How many temporary cooling units are currently onsite?

A9: At this time there are currently 16:

- Bldg 1 packing: 4 units @ 30/40 ton each
- Bldg 2 priming: 2 units @ 10 ton each
- Bldg 2 cafeteria: 1 unit @ 30/40 ton
- Bldg 3 cafeteria: 2 units @ 30/40 ton each
- Bldg 3 West charging (20mm): 1 unit @ 10 ton
- Bldg 8 V&P/F&C: 1 unit @ 30/40 ton
- Bldg 8 North: 1 unit @ 20 ton
- Bldg 11 lead fabrication: 1 unit @ 30/40 ton
- Bldg 11 lead storage: 1 unit @ 30/40 ton
- Bldg 35 primer metal parts: 2 units @ 30/40 ton each (note that most priming, loading, and charging wings already have permanent installed AC, as do most office areas, labs, and the Bldg 1 cafeteria.)

Q10: What are the machines in the new warehouse area in Bldg 1?

A10: The new machines in the Bldg 1 warehouse are the second modernized CCMES unit and its associated bulk case feeder. The second CCMES has been installed temporarily in the warehouse area to permit off-line debugging while awaiting resolution of technical issues with the initial modernized CCMES unit installed on case line #2. Any modifications made to resolve technical issues with CCMES 1 will be retrofitted on CCMES 2 before it is installed on an active case line.

Q11: How many 7.62mm case cells are installed?

A11: Six.



ACC - Rock Island

Q12: Recommend including Quality of Work Environment (QWE) as a separately evaluated component of the solicitation and assign weighting commensurate with the Army's interest in this area.

A12: Projects which may encompass QWE may be included in offerors' proposals in response to the Operations & Facilities Factor, Subfactor 2 – Commercial Utilization and Investment in the Facility.

Q13: Recommend including modernization /optimization of the LCAAP as a separately evaluated component of the solicitation and assign weighting commensurate with the Army's interest in this area.

A13: Projects which may encompass modernization/optimization may be included in offerors' proposals in response to the Operations & Facilities Factor, Subfactor 2 – Commercial Utilization and Investment in the Facility.

Q14: Is there a concern that there is a lack of a TDP for M80A1/M62A1 and how does the government plan on addressing this? Is there a risk that someone exploits this for a change order?

A14: Any cost impact due to configuration change(s) from the solicitation to the contract award will be limited exclusively to that change(s), and will require substantiation via the Changes clause at FAR 52.243-1.

Q15: How we were to get 10 years pricing from RAAP considering they have not awarded the RAAP operating contract and that it is expected to only be a 5 year award?

A15: A re-opener clause for NC is being considered.

Q16: Section I, p165-167, Narrative I0001. Is the offeror required to disclose the metal EPA baselines with proposal submittal? Att 0057 is only referenced within the EPA post award execution language (not required for proposal submission). Where in the draft RFP language is the USG requiring baseline metals be disclosed and submitted within offeror's proposals?

A16: Att 0057 and supporting data is required to be included with proposal submission; verbiage requiring such will be included in the final RFP.



ACC - Rock Island

Q17: Section I, p165-167, Narrative I0001. Is it the intent of the DRFP to fix the metals baseline (copper & zinc) at the same price for all 10 yrs?

A17: Yes, Att 0057 only allows for completion of one price for copper, and one price for zinc, baselining the costs for the contract's period of performance. Clarifying verbiage will be included in the final RFP.

Q18: Section I, p165-167, Narrative I0001. Will the USG consider applying the EPA to Cal .22 rounds?

A18: Yes the USG will consider applying the EPA to Cal .22; final RFP will be reflective of the decision.

Q19: Section L, p187-188, Section III. To further clarify the requirement to include major subcontractors within the Past Performance Volume and the answer to Q#18 in the DRFP Q&A, please define "critical hardware and/or services," as it would classify a subcontractor as a major subcontractor outside of the 25% threshold of the proposed unit price.

A19: Referenced verbiage will be revised in the final RFP.

Q20: Section L, page 186, F.1.b. Regarding the Past Performance Volume, does the "similar production" provision of relevancy for Supply Contracts allow for the inclusion of prime systems contracts if the offeror deems them relevant?

A20: It is the offeror's responsibility to demonstrate relevance in their proposal.

Q21: Section M, page 197, 6. To further expand on the answer to question #19 in the DRFP Q and A, which defines "element" as "any area associated with past performance," how will the Government ensure that incomplete PPIRS data for a DoD contractor does not constitute an overall risk rating in an unfair manner, as compared to commercial contractors?

A21: Under review.



ACC - Rock Island

Q22: As discussed at the Industry Day 3 briefing, the TDPs will not be finalized for the M80A1 and the M62A1/M276A1 rounds at the time of official RFP issuance. Rather than addressing changes with an open-ended, post-award change proposal, will the Government consider: 1) Adding a contract reopener provision for only the A1 specific material & associated labor costs, such as the slug and penetrator, 2) Requesting these DODICs to be bid as NTE pricing, or 3) Assigning these rounds a lower weighted TEP rating?

A22: See Q#14.

Q23: The DRFP states a requirement for FAAT to be performed on all DODICs. It also states that deliveries of product must not be interrupted during the transition period. These two requirements appear to be in conflict. Can the USG provide insight to this apparent conflict?

A23: Verbiage will be revised in the final RFP. The intent was to preclude interruption of services, and meeting contractual delivery schedules for production.

Q24: Can the USG provide additional information regarding the status of 20mm contracts that may be in place beyond 1 Oct 2013?

A24: The new operator will not have any responsibility for 20mm contracts.

Q25: Would the USG consider a pricing adjustment related to overall plant volume?

A25: An overall plant volume adjustment is considered to be included by way of the family volume pricing.

Q26: Recommend including a minimum guaranteed quantity; or consider a re-opener if a minimum quantity isn't reached.

A26: A minimum guaranteed quantity for every year cannot be provided as that requires multi-year authority, which we do not have. However, a minimum guaranteed quantity will be provided under the IDIQ CLINs (for the first DO). While there are no additional guarantees of quantity, IDIQ and Requirement CLINs will be utilized for the items as specified in the RFP and offerors are reminded that LCAAP is the primary source for small caliber rifle ammunition.



ACC - Rock Island

Q27: Request minimum sustainability rates or IBAT quantities be provided.

A27: The plant's capacities have been provided. Minimum sustainability rates and IBAT quantities are subjective based on varying factors and will not be provided.

Q28: Recommendation to consider using separate evaluation of Commercial Utilization Compensation and Contractor Investment as they are very different elements.

A28: Referenced language is under review; revised verbiage will be included in the final RFP.

Q29: Request to provide the USG's calculations for the metal content (regarding EPA).

A29: Will be provided as part of Attachment 0050.

Q30: Narrative H0008, Request USG define when ownership is assumed.

A30: Revised verbiage will be included in the RFP.

Q31: Will Bills of Material (BOMs) for each DODIC be supplied in the VTL?

A31: The USG will not provide the BOM for each DODIC.